

REMARKS

In the application claims 1-5, 9, 10, and 12-14 remain pending. Claims 6-8, 11, and 15-22 have been canceled without prejudice. The pending claims have been amended to clarify what is regarded as the invention. Support for the amendments may be found in the specification, claims, and figures as originally filed and, therefore, no new matter has been added.

No claims presently stand allowed. The reconsideration of the rejection of the claims is, however, respectfully requested.

The pending claims presently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being rendered obvious over Roddy (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0055666) in view of Yang (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0034673). In response to this rejection it is respectfully submitted that neither Roddy nor Yang (whether considered alone or in combination) disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements now set forth within the claims as is required of a *prima facie* case of obviousness. For this reason it is respectfully submitted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 must be withdrawn.

Considering first Roddy, Roddy discloses a system in which vehicle system operating parameters are monitored and transferred to a data center (18). The data center (18) examines the operating parameters to determine if there exists a critical fault or an anomaly in the vehicle system being monitored. If a critical fault or anomaly is detected, the data center (18) develops a service recommendation and the service recommendation may be uploaded to an Internet web page. A user, e.g., service technician, may be notified that the service recommendation has been uploaded to the Internet web page by means of an email message, telephone call, fax, or other form of communication. In this manner, *the user* may begin preparations for a repair activity prior to the vehicle arriving at a repair facility. Thus, it will be appreciated that the system

disclosed within Roddy fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a system such as the system now claimed in which a server functions to extract information from a work order provided to a maintenance system to create an advance demand notice order for items that are to be used during a repair procedure whereupon the created advance demand notice is provided to a distributor system which then functions to both calculate a probability that each of the items specified within the work order will need to be used during the repair procedure and to determine, based on the calculated probabilities, at which one or more of the plurality of geographic locations within the supply chain each of the items needs to be positioned prior to commencement of the repair procedure.

Turning now to Yang, in paragraph 0041 of Yang cited to in the Board Decision a scheduling function of a system is disclosed which functions to merely ensure that all parts necessary to fulfill a service request are in supply at a customer site on or before a promised service date. More particularly, in paragraph 0041 of Yang, the disclosed scheduling function merely coordinates the delivery of items into inventory at the customer site *based on available service parts supply reflected in the inventory plan received from a planning function of the system*. Thus, like Roddy, Yang fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a system in which a distributor system receives an advance demand notice associated with a repair procedure work order and then functions to both calculate a probability that each of the items specified within the work order will need to be used during the repair procedure and to determine, based on the calculated probabilities, at which one or more of the plurality of geographic locations within the supply chain each of the items needs to be positioned prior to commencement of the repair procedure.

In sum, since neither Roddy nor Yang, particularly considering their respective parent applications, include any disclosure that can be said to teach or suggest all of the elements of the invention now set forth with in the claims, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Roddy and Yang cannot support a *prima facie* case of obviousness and, for at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 must be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION


It is respectfully submitted that the application is in good and proper form for allowance. Such action of the part of the Examiner is respectfully requested. Should it be determined, however, that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the attorney undersigned.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee deficiency or credit overpayment to deposit account 50-2428 in the name of Greenberg Traurig.

Date: January 4, 2006

Respectfully Submitted;

By:



Gary R. Jarosik
Reg. No. 35,906
Greenberg Traurig, LLP
77 W. Wacker Drive, Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60601
(312) 456-8449